

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 19 2007

Application No.: 10/539,767

Docket No.: 4590-427

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In response, claim 1 and the specification has been amended to overcome this rejection as discussed below.

Applicants submit the following explanation to clarify the meaning of the terms that the Examiner contends are unclear.

- volume-wise: the reason of the understanding difficulty seems to lie in a slight change of wording based on the translation. The sentence including this term should be understood as: "... to illuminate with coherent light objects that scatter or partially scatter in their volume" (see patent specification, page 4, lines 1-2).
- Specified illumination conditions: "specified" should be understood as "precise", as written in the French specification. This is necessary for reproducing the same illumination conditions during the reading step (see e.g; page 4, lines 8-32).
- Nominal values : since this term seems to be misunderstood, it has been changed to "chosen values" (see page 4, line 25: "...it is possible to choose..." and lines 37 : "...advantageously chosen...").

These changes are permissible because these changes are merely translation changes and further because the PCT application was incorporated by reference in this application. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/539,767**Docket No.: 4590-427**

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being taught by Markantes et al. (US Patent No. 6,970,236). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Markantes et al. discloses a system for authenticating objects that require "an interference security device or feature" (see column 2, line 39, column 3, lines 12-13, column 4, lines 11-19, etc). This extra feature cannot be integrated into certain kinds of objects (see present specification, page 1, lines 32-37). The method of the present invention does not require at all such an extra device. For at least this reason, this rejection should be withdrawn.

All objections and rejections having been addressed Applicant's respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP

Kenneth M. Berner

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: April 19, 2007
KMB/cac